



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,113	07/03/2003	Huican Zhu	60963-0007-US	7671
24341	7590	10/06/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. 2 PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO, CA 94306			BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,113	ZHU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/7/2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application filed **7/3/2003**. IDS filed **1/7/2005**.
2. Claims 1-41 pending. Claims 1-15 have been elected, and claims 16-41 are non-elected, by applicant without traverse. Claims 1-15 are examined on the merits. Claim 1 is independent.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-15 (Group I) in the reply filed on **7/17/2006** is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (hereinafter Bates), U.S. Patent No. 6,404,446 issued June 2002, in view of Dolan et al. (hereinafter Dolan), U.S. Patent No. 5,801,702 issued September 1998.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Bates teaches a graphic display of linked records (i.e. Web pages etc.) (Bates Abstract, Figure 1, column 6 lines 43-50).

Bates teaches a plurality of mapped link records, said records associated with source and target identifiers (Web pages or URLs) (Bates column 6 lines 28-49, Figures 1-2, 4).

Bates teaches (in at least Figures 1, 2) that said link record map is a sorted map, since each record is displayed in a hierarchical order (source to target traversal, etc.), therefore said records are sorted in part on their respective target identifiers.

It is also noted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for at least one record link (i.e. URL) in Bates (Figures 1, 2) to contain an outbound link, since each record is connected accordingly, and it was typical for a Web page to contain outbound link(s), facilitating surfing of the World Wide Web.

Although Bates teaches a map registry (a form of list, i.e. Windows registry, etc.) (Bates column 9 lines 10-14), Bates does not specifically teach said registry as containing a log of records, including source and target records. However, Dolan teaches presentation of a link hierarchy, including a navigation file comprising link records (Dolan Figure 7, column 11 lines 43-55). Dolan teaches in Figure 7 a record comprising at least parent and child pointers to associated record (URLs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates registry, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for display (see also Bates column 25 lines 20-35).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Bates does not specifically teach annotations. However Dolan teaches a record list comprising “title”, and “author”, said title reflective of a description of the subject item intended to inform the user accordingly (an annotation) (Dolan Figure 7, column 12 lines 10-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for descriptive display.

In regard to dependent claims 3, 4, Bates does not specifically teach annotations. However Dolan teaches a record list comprising “title”, and “author”, said title reflective of a description of the subject item

intended to inform the user accordingly (an annotation) (Dolan Figure 7, column 12 lines 10-18). It is noted that Dolan teaches a link record for each link (outbound, etc.). Additionally, Figure 7 also describes a list of attributes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan to Bates, providing Bates the benefit of extra record information for descriptive display.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Bates does not specifically teach a text passage determined from a predetermined distance of an anchor tag. However Dolan teaches various text passages (titles) next to anchor tags (Dolan Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Dolan's titles to Bates, providing Bates's URL display (i.e. Bates Figure 1 "http://ibm.com") extra displayed descriptive information.

In regard to dependent claims 6, 7, although Bates does not forcefully disclose "layering", Bates does teach that a presented link map is a dynamic procedure, whereby node elements are automatically added as new links are taken, etc. (Bates column 7 lines 2-11), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a form of layering is occurring (new links are layered and merged onto the existing map accordingly), providing the benefit of a dynamic surfing history (see also Bates column 27 lines 5-18).

In regard to dependent claim 8, claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale (please see the rejection of claim 1).

In regard to dependent claims 9, 10, although Bates does not forcefully disclose "layering", Bates does teach that a presented link map is a dynamic procedure, whereby node elements are automatically added as new links are taken, etc. (Bates column 7 lines 2-11), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a form of layering is occurring (new links are layered and merged onto

the existing map accordingly), providing the benefit of a dynamic surfing history (see also Bates column 27 lines 5-18).

In regard to dependent claims 11, 12, claims 11, 12 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Bates teaches deletion of nodes as deemed necessary (Bates column 27 lines 1-5). It was well established at the time of the invention for the skilled artisan to apply “house cleaning” to lists of items, deleting items (URL records) which are redundant, no longer valid, etc., in order to save space.

Although Bates does not forcefully disclose “layering” or “merging”, Bates does teach that a presented link map is a dynamic procedure, whereby node elements are automatically added as new links are taken, etc. (Bates column 7 lines 2-11), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a form of layering is occurring (new links are layered and merged onto the existing map accordingly), providing the benefit of a dynamic surfing history (see also Bates column 27 lines 5-18).

In regard to dependent claim 13, Bates teaches deletion of nodes as deemed necessary (Bates column 27 lines 1-5). It was well established at the time of the invention for the skilled artisan to apply “house cleaning” to lists of items, deleting items (URL records) which are redundant, no longer valid, etc., in order to save space. As Bates updates a link map pursuant to record deletion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret deletion as a link (Bates link) as broken, therefore the source identifier would not be referenced.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Bates teaches the Internet (Bates column 6 lines 39-50).

In regard to dependent claim 15, claim 15 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Bates teaches the Internet (Bates column 6 lines 39-50), typically comprising a plurality of interconnected (distinct) computer system hosts.

Bates teaches two addresses reflective of information about each host: "http://ibm.com" and "http://www.uspto.gov" (Bates Figure 1, also column 25 lines 20-35).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
October 1, 2006